

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 19, 2003 (Paper No. 8). Claims 6 to 9, 13 and 15 remain in the application, of which Claims 6 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that the Office Action maintained its requirement to elect between species. The non-elected claims have consequently cancelled, and the requirement is therefore moot. In maintaining this requirement, however, the Office Action mentions that Applicant's traversal "raises an issue of an inadequate written description of the claimed species." Since the Office Action did not enter a rejection based on the written description requirement, Applicant believes that this statement was not intended seriously, but rather was made for the sake of argument in reaction to Applicant's traversal of the requirement. Of course, if the Examiner believes that there is a failure to meet the written description requirement (or, for that matter any of the requirements for patentability), or has any doubt about it, he is urged to enter a rejection.


Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in the application, with Claims 13 and 15/13 being allowed, and Claims 2 and (6 to 9)/2 having been merely objected to for their dependency on a rejected base claim. Based on that indication, Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form, and the dependencies of the remaining claims have been adjusted to depend directly or indirectly from Claim 6. Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 6 to 9, 13 and 15 are all in condition for allowance..

The remaining claims under consideration were all rejected based on art. Thus, Claims 2, 4/2, and 11/2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 4,544,931 (Watanabe), and Claims 5/4 and 10/2 were rejected under § 103(a) over Watanabe, and over Watanabe in view of conventional art. These claims have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of the rejections, and merely to secure an earlier allowance. Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejections of the claims.

No other matters being raised in the Office Action, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 70102 v 1